

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 Q. He being?</p> <p>2 A. Whoever the consultant was. And said, "As of</p> <p>3 tomorrow you are no longer needed here, so pack up and</p> <p>4 get out."</p> <p>5 Q. Ceremoniously, okay. And I assume that's then</p> <p>6 what happened?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And if I understand your testimony earlier,</p> <p>9 you filed a claim for the amounts due under your</p> <p>10 employment agreement, correct?</p> <p>11 A. For the time that I had already worked, yes.</p> <p>12 Q. I'm sorry. From the time you already had</p> <p>13 worked that you hadn't been paid for?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 Q. And that was in the AHERF bankruptcy?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And you believe you received a check sometime</p> <p>18 last year as payment for that claim?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you recall what the amount of the payment</p> <p>21 was?</p> <p>22 A. 120,000, something in that range.</p> <p>23 Q. Was that the amount that you had claimed as</p> <p>24 well or did you claim something more?</p> <p>25 A. I think that was close to the amount that I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you more often than not attend those</p> <p>3 Centennial board meetings to which you were invited?</p> <p>4 MS. ZACH: Objection.</p> <p>5 A. If I was invited, I attended.</p> <p>6 BY MS. MEADEN:</p> <p>7 Q. What about the AHERF board meetings, did you</p> <p>8 always attend the meetings to which you were invited?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Was it your understanding you were invited for</p> <p>11 a particular purpose when you were invited to the AHERF</p> <p>12 board of trustee meetings?</p> <p>13 A. It was usually to report on the Graduate</p> <p>14 hospitals.</p> <p>15 Q. All of the Graduate hospitals or only those</p> <p>16 for which you were responsible?</p> <p>17 A. Sometimes all of those, even though I wasn't</p> <p>18 responsible for them.</p> <p>19 Q. Somewhat of a fluid situation then?</p> <p>20 MS. ZACH: Objection.</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 BY MS. MEADEN:</p> <p>23 Q. If I understand your testimony correctly, your</p> <p>24 responsibilities and the hospitals for which you were</p> <p>25 responsible seem to change during that two-year period</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 claimed.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you have legal representation?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Who was representing you in that, processing</p> <p>5 that claim?</p> <p>6 A. It was a lawyer in the Mescrov firm in</p> <p>7 Philadelphia. M-E-S-C-R-O-V.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you recall the name of the lawyer?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Getting back to the board meetings that you</p> <p>11 attended during the time of October of 1996 to September</p> <p>12 of 1998, I think you told me you attended -- you were</p> <p>13 invited to Centennial board meetings?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 Q. And to AHERF board of trustee meeting,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 A. Correct. I don't know if I was invited to all</p> <p>18 of them, but I was invited to a number of them.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know if you were invited to all of the</p> <p>20 Centennial board meetings?</p> <p>21 A. I believe I was.</p> <p>22 Q. How often did that board meet during that</p> <p>23 time? Do you recall?</p> <p>24 A. Not very often.</p> <p>25 Q. Two or three times a year?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 that you were employed by AHERF, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Was it your view that the changes and the</p> <p>4 frequency in the changes in your responsibilities was</p> <p>5 something that was well thought out?</p> <p>6 MS. ZACH: Objection.</p> <p>7 A. I think it probably was.</p> <p>8 BY MS. MEADEN:</p> <p>9 Q. Who was making those decisions, as you</p> <p>10 understood it, as to what your responsibilities would be</p> <p>11 or the hospitals for which you would be responsible for</p> <p>12 over a given period of time?</p> <p>13 A. I think it was coming from Sheriff's office.</p> <p>14 Q. Would he be the one who would be conveying the</p> <p>15 information regarding how your responsibilities were</p> <p>16 changing?</p> <p>17 A. No, Dr. Kaye would.</p> <p>18 Q. I want to ask you about a couple of other</p> <p>19 hospitals that you have mentioned earlier. One is</p> <p>20 Rolling Hills. Was that known by any other name?</p> <p>21 A. Elkins, E-L-K-I-N-S, Park.</p> <p>22 Q. And the Warminster Hospital, was that also</p> <p>23 known as the Bucks County Hospital?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall when or do you have any</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 knowledge of when the discussions between Graduate 2 Health System and AHERF started over a possible 3 acquisition? 4 A. No, I wouldn't. I think it was sometime near 5 the end of '95 or part of '96. 6 Q. And if I understand your testimony earlier, 7 you were not involved in those discussions with AHERF 8 people? 9 A. Correct. 10 Q. Who from Graduate Health Systems was primarily 11 involved in those discussions? 12 A. I think mostly the board. 13 Q. When you say the -- 14 A. The Graduate Health System board. Bernie 15 Korman for the most part. K-O-R-M-A-N. 16 Q. Did you have any understanding as to who he 17 was dealing with at AHERF in these discussions? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And who was that? 20 A. It was Sherif Abdelhak and David McConnell and 21 Nancy Wynstera, W-Y-N-S-T-E-R-A. 22 Q. And would Mr. Korman report regularly to the 23 Graduate Health System board, to your knowledge, about 24 the progress of those discussions? 25 A. As far as I recall, I think he did, yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 best interest of the hospitals and the doctors and 2 employees to do it. They thought AHERF would make the 3 hospitals more substantial, put capital into the 4 hospitals, and they will all be better off than they 5 were without AHERF. 6 BY MS. MEADEN: 7 Q. Did you have any understanding or was any 8 information conveyed to you regarding AHERF's purported 9 financial condition at that time? 10 A. The only thing I recall was, quote, the 11 billions of dollars they had available. 12 Q. Billions with a B? 13 A. Yes. Billions with a B, on their balance 14 sheet. 15 Q. Did you see or do you know if any of the other 16 board members saw financial statements from AHERF prior 17 to agreeing to a deal? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Do you recall specifically what financial 20 statements from AHERF you would have seen? 21 A. No. 22 Q. Would it have been audited financial 23 statements? 24 MS. ZACH: Objection. 25 A. I would think that it was.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 Q. And do you recall when -- I assume at some 2 point Mr. Korman notified the Graduate Health System 3 board that the discussions had progressed to the point 4 where there was discussion of a possible acquisition and 5 a deal was likely to be done, correct? 6 A. Correct. 7 Q. Do you recall when Mr. Korman advised the 8 board of such event? 9 A. No, I don't. 10 Q. Do you believe it was several months before 11 October 1996? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Did you have any understanding prior to 14 October of 1996 why AHERF was interested in Graduate 15 hospitals? 16 MS. ZACH: Objection. 17 A. My understanding was they wanted to build up a 18 volume of hospitals and then regions so they can better 19 negotiate with the insurance companies there. 20 BY MS. MEADEN: 21 Q. Did you have any understanding as to why 22 Graduate Health Systems would be interested in a 23 possible transaction with AHERF at that time? 24 MS. ZACH: Objection. Asked and answered. 25 A. I think all of us believed that it was in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 BY MS. MEADEN: 2 Q. Do you believe it was audited financial 3 statements for the completed fiscal year immediately 4 before the transaction occurred? 5 MS. ZACH: Objection. 6 A. I don't know, but I would think that it was. 7 BY MS. MEADEN: 8 Q. Was it your understanding that these billions 9 of dollars that were available as reflected on AHERF 10 balance sheet was something that the board of Graduate 11 Health Systems found very persuasive in deciding to go 12 forward with the deal with AHERF? 13 A. I think it helped. 14 MS. ZACH: Objection. 15 BY MS. MEADEN: 16 Q. Do you recall whether there were specific 17 representations made by AHERF as to the amount of 18 capital they were willing to put into the Graduate 19 hospitals? 20 MS. ZACH: Objection. 21 A. I don't recall that. 22 BY MS. MEADEN: 23 Q. Well, did you have an understanding that AHERF 24 was going to make capital improvements to the hospitals? 25 A. Yes.</p>

Page 106

1 Q. And where is it that you got that
 2 understanding?
 3 A. Just from discussions with principals there.
 4 Q. Principals at AHERF?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. Specifically, do you recall who?
 7 A. Abdelhak, McConnell.
 8 Q. After the acquisition, did you see significant
 9 improvements, capital improvements, in the Graduate
 10 hospitals?
 11 A. Not that I'm aware of.
 12 Q. Did you ever have any understanding as to why
 13 those capital improvements weren't made?
 14 A. I just think it was all a matter of timing.
 15 They did use capital to purchase or entice physicians to
 16 come to Graduate Hospital. So there were dollars spent
 17 from that aspect.
 18 Q. That would have been as far as salaries for
 19 those doctors, correct?
 20 A. No. They enticed a significant orthopedic
 21 practice to come there, and I guess they paid them some
 22 sort of stipend, significant stipend, to attract them
 23 there.
 24 Q. But that would have been money that would have
 25 gone to salaries or stipends as opposed to money that

Page 108

1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We have about three minutes
 2 left on this tape. Going off the video record at 12:07
 3 p.m.
 4 (Discussion off the record)
 5 VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the video record at
 6 12:09 p.m.
 7 BY MS. MEADEN:
 8 Q. Mr. Mathews, was the level of AHERF investment
 9 in the Graduate hospitals after the acquisition the
 10 level that you had anticipated prior to the acquisition?
 11 A. I think so.
 12 Q. Do you have any knowledge as to what the level
 13 of debt that the Graduate hospitals was in the October
 14 1996 time period?
 15 A. I remember 135,000 for Graduate and Mount
 16 Sinai combined.
 17 Q. 135,000 --
 18 A. Million. Million.
 19 Q. For Graduate and Mount Sinai?
 20 A. And Mount Sinai.
 21 Q. When you say Graduate, you mean the Graduate
 22 Hospital?
 23 A. Right.
 24 Q. What about the other hospitals?
 25 A. I don't recall the debt on those hospitals.

Page 107

1 was put into improving the facilities at the Graduate
 2 hospitals, correct?
 3 MS. ZACH: Objection.
 4 A. That's correct, but the Graduate Hospital got
 5 the benefit of all those patients that came in the
 6 practice.
 7 BY MS. MEADEN:
 8 Q. But you had said earlier that it was at least
 9 your understanding that there would be significant
 10 monies put into capital improvements at the hospitals.
 11 Were you thinking of infrastructure when you made that
 12 statement?
 13 MS. ZACH: Objection.
 14 A. I'm sorry. There were. It was based on the
 15 capital budgets that were produced each year. So if the
 16 hospital produced the capital budget, usually AHERF
 17 followed along and provided those equipment needs at the
 18 hospitals. So there weren't any specific
 19 structural-type, building-type things that were done.
 20 These were mostly equipment.
 21 BY MS. MEADEN:
 22 Q. Well, were the Graduate hospitals in need of
 23 structural or building changes prior to the acquisition?
 24 A. The only one that was really in need, I guess,
 25 would be Rancocas.

Page 109

1 Q. Do you know if it was greater than or lesser
 2 than the 135 --
 3 A. Lesser, I would think.
 4 Q. In total for the other hospitals or each
 5 individual hospital?
 6 A. I don't recall.
 7 Q. And do you have any understanding as to the
 8 total amount of debt that the AHERF system ultimately
 9 ended up assuming as a result of the Graduate Hospital's
 10 acquisition?
 11 A. I don't recall.
 12 Q. Let me ask you this: Do you know if the AHERF
 13 system did in fact assume the debt of the Graduate
 14 hospitals as a result of the AHERF --
 15 A. That was my understanding.
 16 Q. Do you know if they assumed -- they being
 17 AHERF, assumed all of the debt of the Graduate hospitals
 18 as a result of the acquisition?
 19 A. Again, that's what I thought.
 20 Q. Was it your understanding that Graduate Health
 21 System was going to transfer certain funds over a
 22 three-year period of time to the Graduate Hospital as
 23 part of this transaction with AHERF?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. What was your understanding as to the amount

Page 134

1 A. No.
 2 Q. Did you talk to anyone from Miss Zach's law
 3 firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore other than someone to
 4 discuss the scheduling of your deposition? Did you meet
 5 or talk with anyone from that law firm?

6 A. No.
 7 Q. Did you meet or talk to anyone from
 8 PricewaterhouseCoopers prior to this deposition?

9 A. No.
 10 Q. Did you review any documents in preparing for
 11 this deposition?

12 A. No.
 13 Q. And you were shown hundreds of pages of
 14 documents earlier today, very voluminous exhibits, and
 15 you were asked specific questions about select portions
 16 of those documents, correct?

17 MS. ZACH: Objection.

18 A. Correct.

19 BY MS. MEADEN:

20 Q. And you certainly didn't have the time or
 21 probably the wherewithal to read through all of the
 22 pages that were contained in those exhibits, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. So, it is possible that there may be
 25 information contained within those exhibits that, had

Page 136

1 Q. Do you have any involvement with the Graduate
 2 Health System today?
 3 A. No. Oh, other than I get a pension from the
 4 Graduate Health System.

5 Q. But you are not a member of the Graduate
 6 Health System board or anything like that, correct?
 7 A. Actually, there is no Graduate Health System
 8 anymore anyway.

9 Q. I apologize. You are right. There was a
 10 successor foundation set up now known as the
 11 Philadelphia Health Care --

12 A. Health Trust.

13 Q. Health Trust.

14 MS. MEADEN: I don't believe I have any more
 15 questions, but Miss Zach may.

16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. ZACH:

18 Q. You stated a couple times, I believe, that you
 19 weren't given access to certain documents while you were
 20 president of Centennial. Do you recall making that
 21 statement?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Let me first ask you whether you ever
 24 requested any documents regarding any of the hospitals
 25 within AHERF system that you were refused?

Page 135

Page 137

1 you read it, would have changed some of the answers you
 2 gave here today, correct?

3 MS. ZACH: Objection.

4 A. I doubt it.

5 BY MS. MEADEN:

6 Q. But you certainly didn't read all the pages in
 7 those documents?

8 A. I did not. That's correct.

9 Q. Couple more questions. On the Vanguard
 10 transaction that we had talked about earlier, do you
 11 have any understanding as to why Vanguard didn't
 12 ultimately consummate a deal with AHERF?

13 A. My only understanding was that financials
 14 were -- at the time they were looking at completing the
 15 transaction -- much worse than were projected, and that
 16 Tenet was willing to step up and pay the dollars or take
 17 responsibilities that Vanguard wasn't.

18 Q. Did you ever have any discussions specifically
 19 with anyone from Vanguard as to why they weren't going
 20 to consummate the transaction?

21 A. Exactly what I just told you.

22 Q. I'm trying to find out from whom did you get
 23 that understanding.

24 A. I think it was Galloway or Hough. Probably
 25 both of them.

1 A. No.

2 Q. So, when you say that you weren't given access
 3 to documents, you were meaning that you were not
 4 voluntarily being given certain documents relating to
 5 hospitals that were not within Centennial?

6 A. Correct.

7 MS. MEADEN: Objection.

8 BY MS. ZACH:

9 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that you
 10 would have been refused such documents had you requested
 11 them?

12 A. No.

13 Q. You had a brief discussion with Miss Meaden
 14 regarding possible representations that had been made
 15 about AHERF during negotiations for the acquisition of
 16 the Graduate hospitals. Do you recall that discussion?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Is it fair to say that you have no degree of
 19 certainty regarding what information had passed between
 20 AHERF and Graduate Health System regarding the
 21 acquisition of the hospitals?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. And you don't know with any certainty whether
 24 Graduate Health System had received any audited
 25 financial statements for AHERF or any of AHERF

Page 138

1 hospitals?
 2 MS. MEADEN: Objection.
 3 A. I don't know with certainty. I thought we had
 4 seen audited statements.
 5 BY MS. ZACH:
 6 Q. You believe you had seen them?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. You also discussed briefly the allocation of
 9 corporate overhead to the various AHERF hospitals. Do
 10 you recall that?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. And you said that you did have certain issues
 13 regarding how corporate allocations had been determined
 14 for the Centennial hospitals for which you were
 15 responsible?
 16 A. Well, I don't know if it was just Centennial
 17 hospitals. I have had issues with that over the years
 18 working with hospitals with allocations coming down, so
 19 I just -- they were there. I'm used to just accepting
 20 corporate allocations. It doesn't do you any good to
 21 argue about them, so that's the only reason I said that.
 22 Q. And that was my question. Was there anything
 23 about corporate allocations under the AHERF system that
 24 caused you greater concern than you had seen through
 25 your work with other healthcare systems?

Page 139

1 A. No.
 2 MS. ZACH: I believe that's all I have.
 3 RECROSS EXAMINATION
 4 BY MS. MEADEN:
 5 Q. I do want to follow up on a couple things.
 6 You talked about the documents that you hadn't seen,
 7 hadn't seen all documents I think is what you said. I'm
 8 a little confused about what you meant by that.
 9 A. I just said that because through discussions I
 10 heard about things that happened that were going on, I
 11 had just never seen any documents to back up what those
 12 discussions were. Not that I should have seen them. I
 13 just --
 14 Q. Were those things that were going on within
 15 the Centennial hospitals or within the AHERF system as a
 16 whole or both?
 17 A. As a whole. Anything involving Centennial I
 18 usually had access or I got without any trouble.
 19 Q. Do you believe you had access to -- full
 20 access to all financial information related to
 21 Centennial hospitals?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 MS. ZACH: Objection.
 24 BY MS. MEADEN:
 25 Q. And from whom would you get financial

Page 140

1 information for the Centennial hospitals?
 2 A. Either from the hospitals themselves or from
 3 McConnell or Morrison.
 4 Q. Did you deal directly with Mr. McConnell on
 5 financial information for the Centennial hospitals?
 6 A. Once in a while. Not routinely.
 7 Q. Would that be because of the nature of the
 8 information that you were seeking, you'd go straight to
 9 McConnell?
 10 A. If I had a question about the financials that
 11 the CFO at the hospital couldn't answer, I would go to
 12 him and find out what the answer was.
 13 Q. And did you -- were you satisfied with the
 14 answers that you received from Mr. McConnell in response
 15 to your questions?
 16 A. Yes. Yes.
 17 MS. MEADEN: Nothing further.
 18 MS. ZACH: Nothing.
 19 VIDEOGRAPHER: That concludes today's
 20 deposition. The time on the monitor is 12:51 p.m. We
 21 are now off the record.
 22 MS. MEADEN: The court reporter should forward
 23 the transcript to Mr. Mathews.
 24 You will get 30 days from the receipt of the
 25 transcript to fill out an errata sheet, if you find that

Page 141

1 something was misstated, and then there will be an
 2 address to which you can return it.
 3 THE WITNESS: I can fill names in I remember?
 4 MS. MEADEN: Sure.
 5 (Whereupon, at 12:52 p.m., the deposition was
 6 concluded.)
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 142

1 CERTIFICATE OF OATH
23 THE STATE OF FLORIDA,)
45 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH.)
67 I, Jodi Harmon, Registered Professional
8 Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of
9 Florida at Large, hereby certify that the foregoing
10 witness personally appeared before me and was first duly
11 sworn by me.
12 WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL, this
13 3rd day of July, 2003.14 _____
15 Jodi Harmon, RMR, CRR
Notary Public, State of Florida
Commission Number: CC854931
Expires: July 22, 2003
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 143

1 REPORTER'S DEPOSITION CERTIFICATE
23 THE STATE OF FLORIDA,)
4)
5 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH.)
67 I, Jodi Harmon, Court Reporter, certify that
the foregoing deposition was taken before me in this
8 cause at the time and place and in the presence of
counsel as shown herein; that the foregoing pages
9 contain a true and correct transcription of the
testimony of said witness.
1011 I further certify that I am neither attorney
for any party nor am I related to or employed by any
attorney or party connected with the action, nor am I
12 financially interested in the action.13 The foregoing certification of this transcript
does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any
means unless under the direct control and/or direction
of the certifying reporter.14 So certified, this 3rd day of
15 July, 2003.
1617 _____
18 Jodi Harmon, RMR, CRR
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

McCool Dep.

In The Matter Of:

**AHERF v.
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS**

THOMAS MCCOOL

October 28, 2003

LEGALINK MANHATTAN
420 Lexington Avenue - Suite 2108
New York, NY 10170
PH: 212-557-7400 / FAX: 212-692-9171

MCCOOL, THOMAS - Vol. I



<p>1 under this agreement.</p> <p>2 A. Again, if an event of default has occurred and 3 is continuing uncured, the bank may do the four 4 things enumerated here.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you tell me what -- 6 Is Provision 1 under 7.02(a)(1) that 7 the bank can ask the trustee to declare an 8 event of default with respect to the bonds?</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes. It says what it 10 says, notify the trustee.</p> <p>11 BY MR. TERUYA:</p> <p>12 Q. And would that cause the bonds to be 13 accelerated?</p> <p>14 A. According to the way 7.02(1) is written, yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And was another option that was available to 16 PNC for PNC itself to cause the obligated 17 group's obligations to become immediately due 18 and payable?</p> <p>19 A. One of our options was to notify the trustee of 20 such event of default, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. What were the remedies that you considered at 22 the time to be available to you in dealing with 23 Allegheny General Hospital obligated group's 24 issues at the time you were dealing with that 25 credit?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 58</p> <p>1 options other than what's spelled out in this 2 letter of credit agreement. 3 MS. HACKETT: At the time in 4 evaluating options. What time are you talking 5 about?</p> <p>6 MR. TERUYA: At the time you were 7 dealing with any problems or issues relating to 8 Allegheny General Hospital Obligated Group. 9 THE WITNESS: I think I understand 10 where you're going with the question, and 11 that's why I wanted to be careful that we're 12 talking about options as opposed to per se 13 remedies.</p> <p>14 The document outlines in black and 15 white what various words mean and what 16 contractual relationship exists.</p> <p>17 To the extent, though, that this is a 18 living, breathing company entity on the one 19 hand with management and people involved, and 20 to the extent the bank's comprised of a 21 parallel universe in a sense, there are 22 numerous discussions, assessments, and options 23 explored, so that it's not ultimately reduced 24 to a single determination.</p> <p>25 It's a pretty broad approach we take MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 A. The document speaks for itself. That's our 2 outline.</p> <p>3 Q. Other than the remedies that are available 4 under 7.02, are there any other remedies that 5 you are aware of that PNC had available to it?</p> <p>6 A. I'm not sure how you define "remedies," per se. 7 I mean, there's remedies that are enumerated 8 and defined in contract. 9 Is that what you mean?</p> <p>10 Q. I mean other than remedies that are defined in 11 this contract, was there any other options that 12 PNC considered to be available to it in dealing 13 with any of the problems that you faced at 14 Allegheny General Hospital Obligated Group?</p> <p>15 A. Options are different than -- 16 MR. COGAN: Keep in mind, Item No. 4 here is pretty broad. 17 MR. TERUYA: Sure. 18 MR. COGAN: It's exercise, or cause to be exercised, any and all such remedies as it may have under this agreement or any other document or at law or in equity. 19 MR. TERUYA: I'm just trying to see if there's anything else you would have considered at the time in evaluating your MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 59</p> <p>1 in trying to make the assessment of whether or 2 not there are other options available, 3 including time or extensions of time or some 4 ameliorative characteristic that we might want 5 to put in place to both save ourselves the loss 6 and save the company itself.</p> <p>7 BY MR. TERUYA: 8 Q. Do you recall whether at some point in time you 9 started dealing with issues relating to the AGH 10 Obligated Group?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you recall approximately when that was?</p> <p>13 A. Generally in dealing with the problems in the 14 AGH entity, I'd have to say it was probably 15 sometime in July of 1998.</p> <p>16 Q. How about just in dealing with the AGH 17 Obligated Group in general? Was there some 18 earlier point in time you started dealing with 19 it?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. You mentioned -- 22 We were talking about DVOG earlier. 23 Could you tell me when you first became 24 involved with issues at DVOG.</p> <p>25 A. May of 1998. MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

	Page 62		Page 64
<p>1 Q. What was the event that triggered your 2 involvement with issues at DVOG in May of '98? 3 A. There was a meeting in Philadelphia, I don't 4 recall the exact date, at which the AHERF 5 management basically made a presentation to the 6 creditors, including PNC and MBIA, of what the 7 situation was and what they intended to do. 8 Q. And what was the situation as reported at that 9 time by AHERF management? 10 A. That AHERF management generally had devised a 11 scenario that they wanted to explain to us that 12 would involve basically, as I defined it, 13 basically orphaning the Philadelphia entity, 14 closing up the gates at Fortress Allegheny, and 15 leaving us to our fate. 16 I believe that's exactly how I put it 17 when I got home. 18 Q. When you say "orphaning" the Philadelphia 19 operations, can you explain what you mean by 20 that. 21 A. They meant to abandon them. 22 Q. Into bankruptcy? 23 A. Into whatever it took. In general terms, I 24 don't think they devised or determined what 25 process would be entailed, but the general MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>		<p>1 the meeting and where it took place, and it was 2 actually not a bad lunch. 3 Beyond that, I don't recall. 4 Q. Just to clarify that last answer, do you have a 5 general recollection that some trustees were 6 present, as well? 7 A. Again, my memory could well be faulty. 8 Q. Sure. 9 A. But as I recall, there may have been a couple 10 of the trustees there, yes. 11 Q. Do you recall being told at that time who had 12 made that decision to, as you put it, abandon 13 the Philadelphia operations? 14 A. It was not attributed to any single individual, 15 no. 16 Q. Do you know if any discussion was made as to 17 whether the board of AHERF had considered that 18 decision? 19 A. Again, there was no attribution, as I recall, 20 to who determined that strategy. 21 Q. Do you recall how long that meeting lasted for, 22 that presentation? 23 A. Several hours, because it extended over lunch. 24 Q. Was there any catalyzing event that triggered 25 your involvement with issues at the AGH MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	
<p>1 tenor of their approach was to abandon 2 Philadelphia to its fate, button up the gates 3 in western Pennsylvania, and hope that nobody 4 crossed the moat. 5 Q. So are you saying that the support and credit 6 from AHERF and its western operations would no 7 longer be extended to the Philadelphia 8 operations? 9 A. That was my understanding from that meeting, 10 yes. 11 Q. Do you recall which members of AHERF management 12 were present? 13 A. No, I don't. I believe Tony Sanzo and a number 14 of other people were there, a number of the 15 trustees were there; but I didn't take 16 attendance, and I don't recall exactly who was 17 there. 18 Q. So when you said AHERF management, you don't 19 mean simply management in terms of officers, 20 but you're also including trustees, some 21 trustees, as well? 22 A. My recollection is, and I could be wrong 23 because, as I said, I didn't take attendance at 24 the meeting, and I didn't keep an attendance 25 list. I have a general awareness of who was in MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	Page 63	<p>1 Obligated Group in July of '98? 2 A. The determination basically that a bankruptcy 3 petition would be filed on behalf of the DVOG 4 and AHERF as the parent, and that the AGH 5 entity would not be involved in that. 6 Q. So were you ever in any position to evaluate -- 7 Actually, let me take one step back. 8 Did there ever come a time where you 9 evaluated your options under the AGH Obligated 10 Group letter of credit agreements in terms -- 11 A. Yes, certainly. 12 Q. When was that? 13 A. Likely it would have been in the same time 14 frame, early July '98. 15 Q. Was there any failure on the part of the AGH 16 Obligated Group to comply with any obligations 17 under the letter of credit agreement? 18 A. I don't recall whether there was any technical 19 obligation. 20 Q. Do you recall what options you considered with 21 respect to the Allegheny General Hospital 22 obligated group in terms of this loan 23 agreement? 24 A. In general terms, in early July we had 25 determined that no matter what strategy they MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	Page 65

<p>1 sought to employ in the DVOG side of the 2 company structure, the Allegheny General 3 reimbursement agreement was going to be in 4 default; and so if the generalized plan that we 5 had discussed or had discussed with us by AHERF 6 management was that they would seek to most 7 quickly abandon the eastern operations and, 8 yet, continue to keep the western operations 9 viable, it seemed a bit short-sighted to me, 10 because under the scenario they outlined, the 11 AGH obligations would be in default.</p> <p>12 Q. So what particular options did you consider at 13 that point in time that PNC could take in 14 responding to what you perceived as a 15 forthcoming default by the AGH Obligated Group?</p> <p>16 A. Declaring the default and accelerating the debt 17 by causing a draw under the letter of credit.</p> <p>18 Q. Were there any other options that you were 19 considering at the time?</p> <p>20 A. There were numerous other options in the global 21 sense that we had been discussing not only with 22 the DVOG and AHERF, but because they had an 23 effect on the AGH operations, those were under 24 consideration, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Could you tell me what those other options</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p> <p>1 refused, by the way. 2 Q. We'll come back to that term sheet. I just 3 wanted to back up one step and ask you, did 4 AHERF have any -- the parent corporation -- 5 have any obligations to PNC at the time you 6 were involved with AHERF? 7 A. Other than to the extent that they're involved 8 as a named party on the letters of credit, no. 9 I'm not aware of any. 10 Q. You're not aware of any obligations that AHERF 11 had in terms of particular responsibilities 12 under any agreements to PNC? 13 A. Again, it's five years ago. I'm not aware of 14 any in particular. 15 Q. In addition to the term sheet that you 16 mentioned that was one option that was being 17 considered in accelerating the AGH Obligated 18 Group letter of credit, were there any other 19 options that you were considering in mid 1998 20 with respect to any AHERF entities? 21 A. Again, it was partly based on the constant 22 assessment of the circumstances, the liquidity 23 need of the organization generally as to what 24 could possibly be done. 25 There were numerous meetings that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 were. 2 A. Yes, given the liquidity position of the DVOG, 3 we devised really a term sheet that we had 4 offered to AHERF and its management that would 5 have basically come up with more liquidity for 6 them to meet their obligations in return for 7 which they would have agreed to pledge the 8 western assets to the generalized corporate 9 structure, all the obligations owed to both us 10 and MBIA. 11 Q. That's with respect to DVOG? 12 A. AHERF in a sense, the way we looked at it, was 13 more globally from a liquidity standpoint. In 14 a day-to-day standpoint, it doesn't matter so 15 much who has to make good on the obligation, 16 whether it's to a vendor or whether it's 17 payroll or whether it's any other liquidity 18 need. 19 It was a sense that the company, as a 20 whole, needed liquidity in some amount; and 21 what we devised was a structure that would have 22 provided some liquidity to the company, but we 23 wanted a quid pro quo. 24 We'd put up a liquidity; they had to 25 put up the assets, all of the assets. They</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p> <p>1 occurred in Philadelphia that discussed 2 possible outcomes, and there were lots of 3 potential formulations that ultimately got 4 reduced to that term sheet. 5 Q. In addition to the various options you 6 mentioned, can you think of any others you were 7 considering at the time? 8 A. No. We ran the gamut of what the possible 9 outcomes were and our responses to them, 10 everything from bankruptcy to simply making 11 money available to them under the loosest 12 possible circumstances, so -- 13 Part of the function we serve at the 14 bank is to basically try and cover the 15 waterfront in a sense of what various options 16 were available, not in the formal offered sense 17 to the company, but trying to sort of estimate 18 or formulate in our own minds what happens if I 19 do this, what happens if I don't do this or I 20 do something else. 21 I mean, that's the everyday activity 22 we engage in is constantly making that 23 assessment. 24 Q. As a result of that process of assessing the 25 circumstances, you mentioned two options that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 were considered at the time; one embodied in 2 the term sheet that was offered to AHERF, and 3 another was accelerating the AGH Obligated 4 Group letter of credit.</p> <p>5 Were there any other options that 6 came about as a result of that process that you 7 discussed that you can recall?</p> <p>8 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>9 MS. HACKETT: Can we take a break?</p> <p>10 MR. TERUYA: Sure. Why don't we take 11 a quick break.</p> <p>12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off 13 the record. The time is 10:30.</p> <p>14 -----</p> <p>15 (There was a recess in the proceedings.)</p> <p>16 -----</p> <p>17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 18 record. It is 10:46.</p> <p>19 BY MR. TERUYA:</p> <p>20 Q. I think when we left off we were talking about 21 some of the options that were being considered 22 prior to the bankruptcy by PNC, and you 23 mentioned accelerating the AGH Obligated Group 24 letter of credit and a term sheet that was 25 offered to AHERF, and I was wondering was any MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 security agreement.</p> <p>2 Q. Is this an agreement between the AGH Obligated 3 Group and PNC?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. So it's another letter of credit agreement that 6 was in place at the time between AGH and PNC?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you know if this letter of credit agreement 9 was also irrevocable from PNC's perspective?</p> <p>10 A. That's my understanding.</p> <p>11 Q. And if you could just flip to Page 25 of this 12 agreement, do you see there's a Section 7.01, 13 default, that runs through to Page 27?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And does this section set forth all the 16 possible events of default under this letter of 17 credit agreement?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Looking at 7.01 B, in particular, is there in 20 this letter of credit agreement, like in the 21 last one, a provision that allows AGH Obligated 22 Group 30 days to try to cure any covenant 23 noncompliance?</p> <p>24 A. It looks basically like the same language 25 that's in the other one, yes. MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 consideration ever given to accelerating the 2 DVOG letters of credit?</p> <p>3 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>4 Q. Am I correct that these options were being 5 considered --</p> <p>6 Actually, let me strike that last 7 question.</p> <p>8 Let me show you what's been 9 previously marked as -- we'll spend less time 10 on this document -- but what has been 11 previously marked as Exhibit 326 which, just 12 for the record, is the letter of credit, 13 reimbursement and security agreement, dated as 14 of January 29, 1993, between AGH and Pittsburgh 15 National Bank.</p> <p>16 -----</p> <p>17 (Exhibit No. 326 previously marked for 18 identification.)</p> <p>19 -----</p> <p>20 BY MR. TERUYA:</p> <p>21 Q. Let me ask you as you flip through it if you 22 recognize this document.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Can you tell me what you recognize it as.</p> <p>25 A. It's a letter of credit, reimbursement and MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 Q. And I think you mentioned that you were aware 2 of no policy or practice at PNC with respect to 3 extending the 30-day cure period. Is that 4 right?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. Was that at least an option that PNC have 7 available to it, to extend the period within 8 which AGH Obligated Group would try to cure any 9 covenant noncompliance?</p> <p>10 A. It certainly was an option, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And we earlier were discussing the various 12 options that you were considering before the 13 bankruptcy with respect to the AGH Obligated 14 Group.</p> <p>15 Were those options ones that you were 16 considering both under the last letter of 17 credit agreement, as well as under this letter 18 of credit agreement?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. You can set this document aside.</p> <p>21 In the '90s, were you involved in any 22 way with credit analysis of any AHERF entities?</p> <p>23 A. In the '90s?</p> <p>24 Q. In the '90s.</p> <p>25 A. Yes. MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 Q. Did you participate in any valuation analyses 2 or oversee any valuation analyses of AHERF's 3 hospitals? 4 A. I'm sure I did over time, sure. 5 Q. Looking at this particular document, do you see 6 how there's a discussion on the second page of 7 it for enterprise valuation that shows various 8 publicly traded acute care entities and how 9 they're valued in the market? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Am I correct that essentially this document is 12 taking the prices of those entities and 13 dividing by the revenue to come up with an 14 average value-per-revenue ratio? 15 A. Yes. It's calculated on those four and then an 16 average drawn. 17 Q. And is that a methodology that you employed at 18 the time to do any valuations of AHERF 19 entities? 20 A. Did I employ? 21 Q. Yeah. Did you employ or oversee the valuations 22 using that method? 23 A. No. That wasn't a method I employed, no. 24 Q. What kind of valuations did you perform or 25 oversee the performance of?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 178</p> <p>1 use in performing that kind of analysis? 2 A. In part, it was based -- 3 On the DVOG side, would have been 4 based on the third-party offers that would have 5 been made. On the AGH side, it was part and 6 parcel -- some of this methodology and other 7 estimates based on cash flow, asset values, 8 market share. 9 I mean, there are numerous estimates 10 one can make as to try and derive what an asset 11 value might be. 12 Q. Did you come to any conclusion at the time as 13 to whether AHERF might be able to satisfy all 14 of its debt obligations through a sale of all 15 of its hospitals, both eastern and western? 16 A. In large part, the term sheet addresses in some 17 respects that very issue. 18 The conclusion in formulating that 19 term sheet was that there was virtually no way 20 that the combined valuation would ever satisfy 21 fully all of the obligations, but there was a 22 way to lessen the amount of loss derived from 23 the east by doing a loan on a combined basis 24 and take them to a sale of all of the entities 25 together.</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 A. In large part, I relied on what was being 2 offered for the enterprises. 3 Q. By potential buyers? 4 A. By potential third parties, yeah. 5 Q. Are you referring to the bids that were made 6 around the time of the bankruptcy by Vanguard 7 and Tenet? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Other than valuations by looking at those 10 potential bids, did you perform any other types 11 of valuations or oversee the performance of any 12 other types of valuations? 13 A. Of what entity? 14 Q. Of AHERF hospitals. 15 A. Of each individually or all of them 16 collectively or -- 17 Q. Either individually or grouped in any way. 18 A. We attempted in large part, as this does in its 19 essence, to try and figure out whether or not 20 the AGH entity, which we still believed to have 21 an actual value as opposed to an imaginary 22 value of the other entities, how that would 23 impact our carrying value. Those are the 24 analyses that I was doing. 25 Q. And what kinds of -- what methodology did you</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 179</p> <p>1 Q. And by doing a loan on a combined basis leading 2 to a sale of all entities together, was that a 3 way that AHERF could minimize the losses, as 4 you said? 5 MR. COGAN: Objection. 6 THE WITNESS: That was my belief, 7 yes, that we would be able to minimize our 8 loss. 9 BY MR. TERUYA: 10 Q. In case I misstated it, your view was that a 11 way to minimize the loss to PNC and other 12 creditors was for AHERF to utilize its western 13 region credit, take out a loan for the whole 14 system essentially, and then to proceed with a 15 sale of all of its assets, both eastern and 16 western? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. And did you discuss that opinion with anyone at 19 PNC? 20 A. Quite a number of people, yes. 21 Q. Who would you have had discussions with? 22 A. Ted Paisley, Dave Cook; numerous other people. 23 That's how we devised that term sheet. 24 Q. Did you have any discussions with anyone at 25 AHERF about that proposal?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 A. Once we gave them the term sheet, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Who did you have interactions with about the 3 term sheet?</p> <p>4 A. Tony Sanzo, numerous other people at the 5 meetings; but they were all focused primarily 6 through Tony.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall ever having any meetings with 8 AHERF representatives that included board 9 members relating to the term sheet?</p> <p>10 A. Yes. In the days leading up to the actual 11 bankruptcy filing, the week or so prior to 12 that, I believe we had a number of meetings 13 with AHERF management and a number of the 14 trustees.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you remember which trustees came to those 16 meetings?</p> <p>17 A. You know, I just don't remember which names. I 18 can't remember if Ira Gumberg was there or -- 19 I really just don't remember.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you remember any discussions that you had 21 with any AHERF trustees in particular by name?</p> <p>22 A. Again, I just don't recall who from the trustee 23 side attended the meeting.</p> <p>24 Q. Let me step away from that particular meeting 25 or set of meetings and just ask you generally. MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 182</p> <p>1 A. I believe so, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have any sense as to whether -- or why 3 in particular David Cook was performing this 4 valuation that's embodied in this document?</p> <p>5 A. I don't know why he would have done this in 6 this particular way, although I suspect 7 somebody asked him to.</p> <p>8 Q. You can set aside this document. 9 Let me mark as Exhibit No. 2077 a 10 two-page document with Bates numbers PNC 12024 11 through 12025. 12 It appears to be a letter dated 13 September 3rd, 1998, from Thomas McCool to 14 Robert Maloney of Toronto Dominion Securities, 15 Incorporated. 16 ----- 17 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2077 marked 18 for identification.) 19 ----- 20 (The witness reviewed the document.) 21 ----- 22 BY MR. TERUYA: 23 Q. Let me ask you as you look at it if you 24 recognize this document. Can you tell me what 25 this document is if you recognize it? MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 Do you recall any particular AHERF trustees 2 that you had interaction with during 1998?</p> <p>3 A. I think I just went through that. I can't 4 recall the names of specific trustees that I 5 met with on specific days. I just don't 6 recall. I know they were trustees. I know 7 they were there. I just don't remember their 8 names.</p> <p>9 Q. In terms of the valuations that you did 10 perform, do you know who assisted you in 11 performing those valuations, either at PNC or 12 advisors to PNC?</p> <p>13 A. Ones that I prepared? I prepared them.</p> <p>14 Q. Oh, you did them yourself?</p> <p>15 A. Sure.</p> <p>16 Q. And what kinds of -- 17 What methodology in particular did 18 you use in valuing the AGH entities?</p> <p>19 A. Mostly multiple EBITDA and cash flow.</p> <p>20 Q. So some of those same types of methodologies 21 that are in this document?</p> <p>22 A. Sure.</p> <p>23 Q. Is this a standard method -- 24 Are these standard methods for 25 valuing entities? MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 183</p> <p>1 A. It looks like a letter to Bob Maloney at TD.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you recall what the issue was that led to 3 you sending this letter to Robert Maloney?</p> <p>4 A. I believe TD was a participant in the AGH 5 letters of credit and was questioning, as he 6 properly thought he should, whether or not 7 there was a way for them to get out from under 8 their obligation under their part of the letter 9 of credit.</p> <p>10 Q. I take it this is, in fact, a letter -- 11 Would you recognize your signature on 12 the second page of this?</p> <p>13 A. Oh, that's me.</p> <p>14 Q. And do you recall actually sending this letter 15 to Robert Maloney on or around September 3rd of 16 '98?</p> <p>17 A. It looks like I did.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you recall what the resolution was of any 19 discussion you had with Mr. Maloney about 20 Toronto Dominion's obligation as a participant 21 in the letter of credit?</p> <p>22 A. When the draw occurred, they funded it.</p> <p>23 Q. What questions did Mr. Maloney raise as to 24 whether Toronto Dominion was obligated as a 25 participant under the letter of credit? MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 category, yeah.</p> <p>2 Q. It went down?</p> <p>3 A. It was an attempt to cap the growth in the</p> <p>4 Medicare piece of the budget.</p> <p>5 Q. Were you involved in any discussions with AHERF</p> <p>6 about negotiating a waiver under the -- of</p> <p>7 certain reported noncompliance under the letter</p> <p>8 of credit agreements?</p> <p>9 A. With AGH?</p> <p>10 Q. With either AGH or with DVOG.</p> <p>11 A. I remember discussions with AGH about that, but</p> <p>12 I don't recall with DVOG.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know if at or around the bankruptcy</p> <p>14 David Cook and Frank Taucher were still</p> <p>15 involved in negotiating with AHERF about</p> <p>16 various items relating to the letters of</p> <p>17 credit, including, for example, waivers?</p> <p>18 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>19 Q. More generally, do you know if David Cook and</p> <p>20 Frank Taucher were still in the picture in</p> <p>21 terms of dealing with AHERF at or around the</p> <p>22 time of the bankruptcy?</p> <p>23 A. I don't believe that they were generally, no.</p> <p>24 They may have been involved to the extent the</p> <p>25 AGH piece was still there, because I was</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 198</p> <p>1 Q. Is the reference to Tom in the first paragraph</p> <p>2 a reference to you, if you know?</p> <p>3 A. I believe it is.</p> <p>4 Q. Does looking at this refresh your recollection</p> <p>5 as to whether Frank Taucher and David Cook</p> <p>6 around this time frame were still involved in</p> <p>7 negotiating a waiver in conjunction with you?</p> <p>8 A. It doesn't refresh my recollection, because</p> <p>9 that's not the question you asked me.</p> <p>10 The question you asked me was at or</p> <p>11 around the bankruptcy filing. May 26 is not at</p> <p>12 or around the bankruptcy filing. May 26 is at</p> <p>13 least six weeks prior to the bankruptcy filing.</p> <p>14 And in your view, that may be at or around, but</p> <p>15 in my view, that's a lifetime away.</p> <p>16 Q. In May of '98 and June of '98, were Frank</p> <p>17 Taucher and David Cook still involved in</p> <p>18 negotiating a waiver with AHERF?</p> <p>19 A. In May of '98, they clearly were. In early</p> <p>20 June of '98 they may well have been, because</p> <p>21 the earlier memo was a response to a meeting</p> <p>22 that Paula and Jeff Dickson went to, June 4th.</p> <p>23 Q. Were you involved in these efforts --</p> <p>24 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>25 Q. -- to negotiate a waiver?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 focused on the AHERF/DVOG piece.</p> <p>2 Q. Let me just quickly mark as Exhibit 2078</p> <p>3 a May 26, 1998, document, a letter from Mike</p> <p>4 Martin to David Cook with Bates numbers</p> <p>5 PNC 23702 through 709.</p> <p>6 -----</p> <p>7 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2078 marked</p> <p>8 for identification.)</p> <p>9 -----</p> <p>10 BY MR. TERUYA:</p> <p>11 Q. I don't think you're a recipient under this</p> <p>12 document, but all I was curious about is do you</p> <p>13 see that in this letter in the first sentence</p> <p>14 there's a reference to it was good seeing you,</p> <p>15 as well as Tom and Frank, on the 22nd; thanks</p> <p>16 for coming across the river; and then there's a</p> <p>17 discussion below about various items of</p> <p>18 noncompliance at the AHERF entities?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you see that on the second page, for</p> <p>21 example, there's a discussion there in a matrix</p> <p>22 of various items that are being negotiated with</p> <p>23 with respect to a, among other things, a waiver</p> <p>24 under the letter of credit agreement?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 199</p> <p>1 A. I was involved in these efforts to discover the</p> <p>2 parts of this that have to do with, for</p> <p>3 instance, the monthly cash budget for each</p> <p>4 AHERF entity, the quarterly cash budget for</p> <p>5 each AHERF entity, projections of LTDC</p> <p>6 liquidity and DSC ratios through April, May,</p> <p>7 and June, cash budgets for AHERF and each</p> <p>8 entity for July and August with and without</p> <p>9 Vanguard, monthly reports of actual versus</p> <p>10 budget for all AHERF entities, approval by PNC</p> <p>11 of use of proceeds from Vanguard, status of all</p> <p>12 intercompanies between each AHERF entity</p> <p>13 beginning with 3-98 --</p> <p>14 Yes; I was involved in all those</p> <p>15 questions.</p> <p>16 Q. And who had primary responsibility in May and</p> <p>17 early June of '98 for negotiating a waiver with</p> <p>18 AHERF entities?</p> <p>19 A. I'm sure David and Frank were still intimately</p> <p>20 involved in that, because to me, that's just a</p> <p>21 documentation issue at the time.</p> <p>22 Q. Were they reporting to you at this time?</p> <p>23 A. No, not formally.</p> <p>24 Q. Who had the call as to whether to enter into a</p> <p>25 waiver under any of the letter of credit</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 agreements with any of the AHERF entities in 2 May of '98 or early June of '98? 3 A. The bank did. 4 Q. Would it be Frank Taucher and David Cook's side 5 of the bank or your side? 6 A. The bank had the call, because the bank in the 7 collective sense makes the call. In a credit 8 of this size, no individual is going to be 9 given free rein to say aye or nay. 10 We're talking about a relationship 11 here that exceeded \$100 million. It would have 12 involved David; it would have involved Frank; 13 it would have involved me; it would have 14 involved Ted Paisley; and I'm sure at some 15 stage it would have involved Jim Rohr, Helen 16 Pudlin, and possibly even Tom O'Brien. 17 Q. What position did Helen Pudlin hold at this 18 time? 19 A. She's a chief counselor. 20 Q. How about Jim Rohr? 21 A. He's the president of the bank. 22 Q. Would the SAC committee have had any 23 involvement in making a decision to enter into 24 a waiver? 25 A. No.</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	Page 202	Page 204
<p>1 Q. How about a senior loan committee? 2 A. No. 3 Q. Just the individuals you mentioned? 4 A. The approval process in a sense, the SAC 5 committee doesn't have anything to do with 6 approval of waivers or amendments or anything 7 else. It's a reporting body that reflects on 8 the asset value in the sense of the balance 9 sheet items the bank holds in its loan 10 portfolio. 11 The approval process for waivers and 12 amendments is the same as for making a new 13 loan. In a sense, it's the same general 14 people, except when it's in workout, and it 15 comes through a slightly different avenue, 16 namely, it has to come down my street or 17 somebody like me. 18 But in this particular circumstance, 19 given the size of the credit and the nature of 20 the credit, it would have involved more than 21 just the normal sort of committee process. 22 Q. I think you said normally a senior loan 23 committee is involved in making credit 24 decisions. Is that right? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	Page 203	Page 205

<p>1 A. No. You mean in terms of day-to-day 2 operations?</p> <p>3 Q. Overseeing its day-to-day operations and what 4 it was doing?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Did anyone at PNC, to your knowledge?</p> <p>7 A. Not -- except through the committee, to the 8 extent the committee was involved, the 9 unsecured committee.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know if any representatives of the 11 committee or PNC observed what operations were 12 going on at AHERF after the bankruptcy?</p> <p>13 A. You're going to have to define "operations" for 14 me.</p> <p>15 Q. I just mean like in terms of how the hospitals 16 were doing and what kinds of management 17 decisions were being made to preserve value.</p> <p>18 A. You mean financial reports or cash flow reports 19 or --</p> <p>20 Q. No, I mean actual operations of the hospitals 21 like how the sale process was going, how, you 22 know, the doctor and patient situation that you 23 described was being handled, how the faculty 24 situation was being handled, et cetera.</p> <p>25 A. Did we oversee it?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 234</p> <p>1 A. Because I know what a due diligence process is 2 supposed to entail. In large part, it's an 3 establishment of a data center and a data room, 4 whether it's at one of the hospitals or one 5 room at all of the hospitals. These guys 6 didn't have anything like that.</p> <p>7 Q. AHERF management did not?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Who was running the due diligence process at 10 AHERF?</p> <p>11 A. In large part it was Tony and Joe Dionisio, I 12 think, and they may have designated other 13 people, but we thought they were generally 14 responsible for it.</p> <p>15 Whether they had the Hunter Group -- 16 I think they confined the Hunter 17 Group, as I recall, to more or less the 18 day-to-day hospital operations, and they were 19 going to take care of the sale themselves; but 20 I remember specifically asking them to take me 21 to the data room.</p> <p>22 Q. Did you view it as a mistake that prior to that 23 time AHERF management had not created a data 24 room where all the documents were kept?</p> <p>25 A. It may or may not be characterized as a MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 Q. Are you aware of anyone at PNC --</p> <p>2 A. Are you talking about overseeing in terms of 3 managing? That's what an overseer is. What do 4 you mean?</p> <p>5 Q. Did anyone monitor, anyone at PNC or any 6 members of the creditors' committee, monitor 7 the operations of the AHERF hospitals?</p> <p>8 A. Generally we had regular meetings with our 9 advisors and accountants, we met with the 10 company's advisors and accountants, and we met 11 with the company on a regular basis.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you recall ever learning of any problems 13 that AHERF was facing in terms of attempting to 14 sell the eastern region hospitals after the 15 bankruptcy?</p> <p>16 A. Yeah, a whole series of them. It's almost 17 impossible to enumerate all of them.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you recall ever hearing that there was any 19 problem in terms of managing the due diligence 20 process with respect to the hospitals?</p> <p>21 A. That was one of them.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you recall ever hearing that --</p> <p>23 A. I actually caused a good bit of that, thank 24 you.</p> <p>25 Q. You how was that?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 235</p> <p>1 mistake, but I'm unaware of any corporate sale 2 that has ever taken place without one.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you recall having any concerns about any of 4 management's conduct in running the sale 5 process and due diligence process with respect 6 to the eastern regional hospitals after the 7 bankruptcy other than what you just mentioned?</p> <p>8 A. I just thought from the committee's standpoint, 9 this was not a well-oiled machine --</p> <p>10 Q. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>11 A. -- in any sense. They simply didn't approach the tasks they were charged with as professionally -- or with professional advice. Whatever they did, they didn't seem to do very well.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you think there was any problem with the 13 fact that AHERF had not approached other 14 potential buyers other than Vanguard and Tenet 15 prior to the bankruptcy? MR. COGAN: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know whether that may or may not have been a root cause of the basic problem. I don't think limiting it to two --</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 They could have had ten.</p> <p>2 BY MR. TERUYA:</p> <p>3 Q. They just weren't handling the process well?</p> <p>4 A. I didn't think so.</p> <p>5 Q. Did you or any other representatives of MBIA or 6 the committee ever take any steps to intervene 7 in terms of management's conduct in running the 8 sale and due diligence process other than what 9 you said about asking that a data room be 10 created?</p> <p>11 A. I think we made suggestions and comments, but 12 as creditors and ultimately even as members of 13 the unsecured creditors' committee, this isn't 14 a process where you can simply step in ala the 15 European process, damn it, step in and just 16 take over and do it yourselves.</p> <p>17 This arrangement and this legal 18 system simply doesn't permit that to occur. We 19 can have opinions; we can even express those 20 opinions, but whether they have effect on the 21 parties to whom we're expressing them, though, 22 is a different story.</p> <p>23 Here, they apparently had little 24 effect.</p> <p>25 Q. If an event of formal default had been declared MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 238</p> <p>1 management, change management, hire a crisis 2 manager, take steps like that; and sometimes we 3 get what we want, and sometimes we don't.</p> <p>4 Q. It's still a negotiated process even in 5 instances like that?</p> <p>6 A. Unfortunately, given the U.S. legal system, 7 it's still a negotiated process, yes.</p> <p>8 It's one of the flaws here, that and 9 the elimination of debtors' prison, but that's 10 just me.</p> <p>11 Q. I'm sorry. That and what?</p> <p>12 A. The elimination of debtors' prisons, but that's 13 just me.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you have any understanding of whether there 15 was a refinancing of AHERF's -- or AGH's bonds 16 at some point in time after the bankruptcy 17 filing by AHERF?</p> <p>18 A. No, there was a refinancing of the West Penn 19 bonds and then a refinancing -- or reissuance 20 of certain of the AGH bonds as part of the West 21 Penn transaction.</p> <p>22 Q. So is it your understanding that the AGH bonds 23 were defeased using the proceeds of the West 24 Penn bond offer?</p> <p>25 A. No. MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 by PNC, could PNC then have forced management 2 to make certain decisions with respect to the 3 sale process?</p> <p>4 A. To the extent that it would have caused them to 5 end up in the bankruptcy sooner, I don't think 6 it would have had substantial effect, because 7 they still would have been in place. They 8 still would have been the same people.</p> <p>9 Q. After PNC declares an event of default in terms 10 of the available remedies that PNC has, can PNC 11 force management of a borrower to make certain 12 decisions at that point?</p> <p>13 A. We can negotiate it for that.</p> <p>14 Q. I'm sorry?</p> <p>15 A. We can negotiate for that outcome; but in terms 16 of forcing it as if forcing it will lead to its 17 implementation, no, that's not how it works.</p> <p>18 Q. Can PNC ever force management to make certain 19 decisions in terms of the rights it has 20 available to it under the letters of credit 21 agreement?</p> <p>22 A. We have made it a --</p> <p>23 We have done it in the past where we 24 requested or required that for, say, new money 25 advances that the company would alter MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 239</p> <p>1 Q. That's not your understanding?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you have any understanding of whether AGH 4 bondholders have been repaid?</p> <p>5 A. I believe they have.</p> <p>6 Q. Did PNC suffer any losses with respect to the 7 AGH Obligated Group letters of credit?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, we did.</p> <p>9 Q. What losses were suffered?</p> <p>10 A. In rough terms, I'm trying to recall, but it 11 would have been somewhere on the order of 12 \$13 million to \$14 million.</p> <p>13 Q. And what constituted those losses?</p> <p>14 A. The repayment of the bondholders under our 15 letter of credit, and the refinance -- the 16 purchase combination of West Penn and AGH and 17 the amount of money we actually received in 18 that transaction.</p> <p>19 Q. So even after the West Penn bond offering, AGH 20 Obligated Group still didn't have enough money 21 to repay the bondholders. Is that what you're 22 saying?</p> <p>23 A. That's right.</p> <p>24 Q. Was the AGH Obligated Group able to repay the bondholders to some extent?</p> <p>25 MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 A. The bondholders were paid in full. They had 2 an LC. 3 Q. A letter of credit? 4 A. We, as the letter of credit holder, were not 5 paid in full, because we paid the bondholders; 6 but AGH did not pay us the full amount. 7 Q. Okay. So the total magnitude of the AGH 8 letters of credit, as we've seen, was far in 9 excess of \$13 million. Right? 10 A. Our share of that was roughly \$44 million. 11 Q. \$44 million. Okay. 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. And you, PNC, recovered the amount of the 14 letters of credit except for \$13 million to 15 \$14 million. Correct? 16 A. The way the deal was structured in the West 17 Penn transaction is we received two-thirds in 18 cash, and we received one-third in a very soft, 19 very subordinated note, which we value at zero. 20 Q. And what is the purpose of that note? 21 A. Actually, you'd have to ask Morgan. They 22 wanted it more than I did. 23 Q. Do you know if that note is supposed to -- 24 Well, let me rephrase that. Who 25 still owes PNC the \$13 million to \$14 million?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 242</p> <p>1 the form of bridge financing to assure the 2 liquidity of the overall system which is first 3 as to priority in payment of West 4 Penn/Allegheny Health System, which is the 5 combined entity. 6 The next is the refinanced MBIA 7 bonds, as well as additional amounts that were 8 issued in order to make a cash payment to PNC, 9 Sumitomo, and Morgan, all of whom received 10 roughly two-thirds of their obligation in cash 11 and the other one third in junior notes that 12 are subordinated first to the \$125 million in 13 Highmark debt and next to the \$300 million or 14 \$400 million of MBIA, slash, bondholder debt; 15 and then there's about \$43 million in total of 16 these what are called -- I forget. I think the 17 name we came up with actually were FRRCs, 18 floating rate restructuring certificates. 19 BY MR. TERUYA: 20 Q. So currently right now the sum of that is that 21 PNC is owed \$13 million to \$14 million from 22 West Penn and -- 23 A. West Penn/Allegheny Health System. 24 Q. And a note has been tendered or provided by 25 that system to PNC?</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>
<p>1 A. West Penn/Allegheny Health System. 2 Q. And what are the terms of that -- or what is 3 the nature of that obligation of West Penn to 4 PNC? 5 MS. HACKETT: What do you mean 6 "nature"? 7 MR. TERUYA: How is it that West 8 Penn -- 9 MR. COGAN: A subordinated note. 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. It's a very 11 subordinated note. 12 MR. TERUYA: So West Penn currently 13 doesn't have enough money to pay PNC. Is 14 that -- 15 MS. HACKETT: Currently? You mean as 16 of today? 17 MR. TERUYA: Well, at the time 18 whenever this occurred, whenever the bond 19 offering occurred and PNC ended up being owed 20 \$13 million to \$14 million. I'm just trying to 21 understand why is it -- 22 THE WITNESS: I would have to go 23 through the whole structure of the West 24 Penn/Allegheny merger, but in summary form, 25 Highmark advanced \$125 million to West Penn in</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	<p>Page 243</p> <p>1 A. Right, with a maturity date of the year 2030. 2 Q. And that note is for \$13 million to 3 \$14 million? 4 A. Face amount. 5 MR. COGAN: That's what he said three 6 times, Kevin. 7 MR. TERUYA: All right. Well, I'm 8 just trying to make sure I understand it 9 MR. COGAN: It is pretty clear. 10 THE WITNESS: I think you're getting 11 it. 12 BY MR. TERUYA: 13 Q. Do you have any understanding of whether the 14 DVOG bondholders have been repaid in full? 15 A. They have. From PNC's -- the bondholders that 16 were backed up by PNC, the letter of credit has 17 been paid in full. 18 Q. Okay. Let me just mark as Exhibit 2079 a copy 19 of a February 11, 2003, transcript from SEC 20 versus Buettner, et al., litigation; and this 21 is the 30(b)(6) deposition of Thomas J. McCool. 22 ---- 23 (Deposition Exhibit No. 2079 marked 24 for identification.) 25 ----</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>

<p>1 to privilege, the concern we have is we're 2 trying to understand what personal knowledge he 3 has and what he might testify about at trial if 4 he were ever called, and am I understanding you 5 correctly that by objecting on the grounds of 6 privilege that you and/or the committee aren't 7 going to call him as a witness to testify about 8 the topics that I asked about?</p> <p>9 MS. HACKETT: No.</p> <p>10 MR. COGAN: Now that's a silly 11 question. I mean, you're going to be preparing 12 witnesses, and are you suggesting that in the 13 preparation of those witnesses that if I 14 inquire, force you to invoke the privilege, 15 then I can then turn around and say, oh, by the 16 way, all the Coopers & Lybrand witnesses can't 17 testify?</p> <p>18 MR. TERUYA: No. I'm asking whether 19 he has personal knowledge of various topics 20 just to understand what he might testify about.</p> <p>21 MS. HACKETT: Let's go off the 22 record. I want to go off the record.</p> <p>23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off 24 the record. It is 4:34.</p> <p>25 -----</p> <p>MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	Page 274	Page 276
<p>1 (There was a discussion off the record.) 2 -----</p> <p>3 MR. TERUYA: We are back on the 4 record.</p> <p>5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: It is 4:36.</p> <p>6 MR. TERUYA: I just wanted to state 7 on the record that at various points in time 8 you've asserted privilege objections to certain 9 questions I've asked about what Mr. McCool has 10 personal knowledge about, and we're trying to 11 obtain discovery about what he knows, what he 12 might testify about from his personal 13 knowledge; and to the extent we've been 14 precluded from doing that, we reserve our 15 rights to consider our options and to seek 16 appropriate relief at an appropriate time from 17 the Court, if needed.</p> <p>18 MS. HACKETT: Whatever that may be, 19 of course.</p> <p>20 MR. TERUYA: Okay.</p> <p>21 MS. HACKETT: Okay.</p> <p>22 MR. TERUYA: And your position is 23 that he cannot --</p> <p>24 MS. HACKETT: Please don't do that. 25 I don't want to be led by you into some MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY</p>	Page 275	Page 277

	Page 278	Page 280
1 financial statements is important for the bank		1 -----
2 in its relationships with its creditors. Is		2 (The proceedings were concluded at 4:43 p.m.)
3 that correct?		3 -----
4 A. Yes.		4
5 Q. When you have timely and accurate financial		5
6 information, that allows you to make more		6
7 informed decisions. Is that right?		7
8 A. Yes.		8
9 Q. And when you don't have timely and accurate		9
10 information, the decisions that you make may		10
11 not be, as we say, well informed.		11
12 A. Generally that's true, because they lack the		12
13 proper and sufficient information.		13
14 Q. And if you had had --		14
15 If I understand this testimony, if		15
16 you had financial information that was more		16
17 accurate and was more timely, then you would		17
18 have been in a better position to assess the		18
19 various options that the bank may have had. Is		19
20 that right?		20
21 MR. TERUYA: Objection.		21
22 THE WITNESS: Generally, yes.		22
23 MR. COGAN: That's all. Thank you.		23
24 MR. TERUYA: Let me ask a couple of		24
25 questions just in follow-up.		25
MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY		MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY

	Page 279	Page 281
1 -----		1 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA) CERTIFICATE
2 RE-EXAMINATION		2 COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY) SS:
3 -----		3 I, G. Donavich, RPR, CRR, a Court Reporter and
4 BY MR. TERUYA:		4 Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of
5 Q. Am I correct that you still stand by your view		5 Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that the witness,
6 that even if you had had different financial		6 THOMAS McCool, was by me first duly sworn to testify
7 information about the AHERF system, you don't		7 to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
8 know what steps PNC or yourself would have		8 truth; that the foregoing deposition was taken at the
9 taken that would have been different?		9 time and place stated herein; and that the said
10 A. No, I don't.		10 deposition was recorded stenographically by me and
11 Q. And you don't know what the effects would have		11 then reduced to printing under my direction, and
12 been of any steps that PNC or you might have		12 constitutes a true record of the testimony given by
13 taken that would have been different based on		13 said witness.
14 receiving different financial information?		14 I further certify that I am not a relative or
15 A. No, because we'd be speculating. As I said		15 employee of any of the parties, or a relative or
16 here, it's really impossible to predict what		16 employee of either counsel, and that I am in no way
17 the outcome would have been, only that it would		17 interested directly or indirectly in this action.
18 have occurred sooner.		18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
19 MR. TERUYA: I don't have any further		19 and affixed my seal of office this 30th day of
20 questions -- subject to the earlier qualifier,		20 October, 2003.
21 I mean.		21
22 MS. HACKETT: Thank you.		22
23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: With there being		23 _____
24 no further questions, this deposition is		24 Notary Public
25 concluded.		25
MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY		MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY

Page 282

1 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA) E R R A T A
2 COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY) S H E E T2 I, THOMAS McCOOL, have read the foregoing pages
3 of my deposition given on Wednesday, October 28,
4 2003, and wish to make the following, if any,
5 amendments, additions, deletions or corrections:
Page/Line Should Read Reason for Change

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 In all other respects, the transcript is true and
correct.

20

21 _____ THOMAS McCOOL
22 Subscribed and sworn to before me this
23 _____ day of _____, 2003.24 _____ Notary Public
25 AKF Reference No. gd77905

MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP., A LEGALINK COMPANY

In The Matter Of:

**AHERF v.
PRICEWATERHOUSE COOPERS, LLP**

**ROBERT MCNAIR
January 17, 2003**

**MANHATTAN REPORTING CORP.
420 Lexington Avenue - Suite 2108
New York, NY 10170
PH: 212-557-7400 / FAX: 212-692-9171**

MCNAIR, ROBERT (1/17/2003)

Word Index included with this condensed transcript

ROBERT M. MCNAIR, JR.

Page 62

1 was dealing on his own with the HSI people. 10:17:57
 2 Q. Is the technology that you reference, is that 10:18:01
 3 the 4G technology? 10:18:02
 4 A. Yes. That's correct. Which had originated 10:18:04
 5 at Graduate, but which had been sold off to QualMed as 10:18:07
 6 part of the deal in which Greater Atlantic was sold. 10:18:10
 7 Q. And under the revised transaction deal 10:18:14
 8 structure, was, essentially, the Graduate, former 10:18:19
 9 Graduate hospitals, were they going to merge into SDN? 10:18:25
 10 A. That's my recollection, yes. 10:18:30
 11 Q. And then I guess the hospital entity, 10:18:30
 12 Zurbrugg Memorial Hospital, was going to merge into 10:18:35
 13 Horizon Medical Corporation? 10:18:38
 14 A. That's correct. That's correct. 10:18:42
 15 Q. And was SDN also going to acquire various 10:18:42
 16 other former Graduate Health System entities? 10:18:43
 17 A. Yeah. I think it took over most, if not all, 10:18:46
 18 of those entities that were reflected on that 10:18:47
 19 organizational chart. I couldn't tell you with 10:18:50
 20 absolute precision that they were all there, but many 10:18:54
 21 of them were. 10:18:54
 22 Q. And were those acquisitions effectuated by a 10:18:54
 23 merger or were they more like a stock transaction? 10:18:55
 24 A. No. They kind of came along because we had 10:18:59
 25 taken over the entities which ultimately -- which 10:19:00

Page 64

1 let's hope not. 10:20:01
 2 Q. I'm talking about little computer-generated 10:20:04
 3 footers, and let me find an example. 10:20:06
 4 A. Yeah. You'll see the DVR footers, which 10:20:09
 5 are -- identified the Delaware Valley region. 10:20:13
 6 Q. If you turn to Page PH 7386, which is behind 10:20:16
 7 Tab 5, or really it's right in front of Tab 6. 10:20:21
 8 A. Okay. Yes. 10:20:26
 9 Q. Do you see how it says RMM -- 10:20:35
 10 A. Yes. That's clearly me. That's correct. 10:20:37
 11 Q. So anywhere we see a footer like that, that 10:20:39
 12 means that you created that document? 10:20:41
 13 A. Presumptively, yeah. I mean, if you want to 10:20:42
 14 ask me about specific ones. I would assume nobody 10:20:46
 15 else would use that, but as I say, given what I've 10:20:47
 16 learned since then, I wouldn't put anything past 10:20:51
 17 anyone. 10:20:58
 18 Q. And at this time, were you assistant 10:21:00
 19 secretary of SDN? 10:21:02
 20 A. Yes, I was. 10:21:05
 21 Q. Do you recall when you first became assistant 10:21:06
 22 secretary of SDN? 10:21:08
 23 A. I can't say that with great certainty. I 10:21:11
 24 will tell you that SDN was the remnant of United 10:21:14
 25 hospitals. In fact, it was the old United hospitals 10:21:26

Page 63

1 owned the stock. Over time, after the transactions 10:19:04
 2 were done, we merged many of them out of existence, as 10:19:05
 3 I recall, and kind of tried to clean up the 10:19:09
 4 organizational chart, but that was not done at that 10:19:12
 5 time. 10:19:14
 6 Q. Did you draft many of the documents in 10:19:15
 7 Exhibit No. 988? 10:19:18
 8 A. I did. 10:19:19
 9 Q. And did you -- to the extent certain 10:19:20
 10 documents in here were filed with governmental 10:19:24
 11 agencies, were you in charge of filing them? 10:19:25
 12 A. I prepared them for filing. They were 10:19:28
 13 actually filed, as I recall, by our senior paralegal 10:19:29
 14 from Pittsburgh, Kathleen Saunders, who actually flew 10:19:32
 15 in to Philadelphia one day and picked up the documents 10:19:36
 16 and took them to Pittsburgh and filed them. But they 10:19:40
 17 were prepared for filing by our office, yes. 10:19:40
 18 Q. I notice on certain documents that there's a 10:19:42
 19 little footer that says RMM? 10:19:44
 20 A. That would be me. 10:19:47
 21 Q. Anywhere we see that footer, does that mean 10:19:50
 22 that document was at least initially prepared by you? 10:19:52
 23 A. Probably. If you want to call my attention 10:19:54
 24 to specific ones. I wouldn't be surprised if somebody 10:19:56
 25 put my initials on something that I prepared, but 10:19:59

Page 65

1 entity, which Mr. Abdelhak had not wanted to bring 10:21:26
 2 into the Allegheny system, so he had sort of told me 10:21:26
 3 back in the summer of '91 to, quote, make it go away, 10:21:26
 4 but not make it go away in the sense of having the 10:21:30
 5 corporation disappear. He just didn't want -- he 10:21:33
 6 wanted it to kind of be sitting out there, which it 10:21:34
 7 did. 10:21:37
 8 The SDN initials obviously stand for 10:21:37
 9 Sheriff, David and Nancy, who were the three directors. 10:21:41
 10 I cannot tell you with certainty when I became an 10:21:44
 11 assistant secretary, but, as best I recall, I was. 10:21:45
 12 Q. Was it before the GHS acquisition in '96? 10:21:50
 13 A. To the best of my recollection, yes. 10:21:53
 14 Q. Was Donald Kaye also one of the directors of 10:21:56
 15 SDN? 10:21:59
 16 A. As I recall, yes, he was. 10:22:00
 17 Q. And just to clarify, on PH 7414 -- 10:22:04
 18 A. Which tab? 10:22:08
 19 Q. Which is right in front of Tab 12. 10:22:09
 20 A. Yes. 10:22:18
 21 Q. Do you see there's a different kind of footer 10:22:18
 22 that says RMM:SSA? Do you know what that means? 10:22:20
 23 A. Yeah. What this means is, this was typed by 10:22:25
 24 Beth Boyer, who was Mr. Abdelhak's assistant, and it 10:22:28
 25 would have been something that I gave her to type, 10:22:32